



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,091	11/16/2001	William D. Corti	BUR920000199	8058

29625 7590 04/06/2004

MCGUIRE WOODS LLP
1750 TYSONS BLVD.
SUITE 1800
MCLEAN, VA 22102-4215

EXAMINER

WILSON, YOLANDA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2113

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

52

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/683,091

Applicant(s)

CORTI ET AL.

Examiner

Yolanda Wilson

Art Unit

2113

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-9 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 3, 10-16, 20 and 21 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

THIRD DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 2,3,10-16,20,21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1,4,5,6,17,18,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Edwards et al. (US Publication Number US 20030056154A1). As appears in claim 1, Edwards et al. discloses a single chip device internally including a signal processing unit, a plurality of memory blocks and a data capturing unit; and a host unit externally provided to said single chip device and generating control signals to control said data capturing unit, wherein said data capturing unit captures data processed by said signal processing unit in response to said control signals from said host unit and transfers said captured data to said host unit without interrupting operations of said signal processing unit on page 4, paragraphs 0056 – 0057,0060,0061,0067.

4. As per claim 4, Edwards et al. discloses a control unit controlling operations of said data capturing unit in response to the control signals from said host unit; a buffer unit storing said data processed by said signal processing unit; and a communication unit transferring said control signals from said host unit to said control unit and transferring said data captured by said buffer unit to said host unit on page 4, paragraphs 0056 – 0057, 0060, 0061, 0067.

5. As per claim 5, Edwards et al. discloses said buffer unit comprises a static random access memory (SRAM) on page 4, paragraph 0056.

6. As per claim 6, Edwards et al. discloses wherein said control unit includes a trigger unit for monitoring said data processed by said signal processing unit to determine a current trigger mode of said OCLA system on page 4, paragraphs 0059, 0060, 0061.

7. As per claim 17, Edwards et al. discloses digital signal processing (DSP) core logic; and on-chip logic analysis (OCLA) logic capturing data processed by said DSP core logic without interrupting operations of said DSP logic, wherein said OCLA logic is controlled by a host unit externally provided to said single chip device on page 4, paragraphs 0056 – 0057, 0060, 0061, 0067.

8. As per claim 18, Edwards et al. discloses wherein said OCLA logic comprises: control logic for controlling operations of said OCLA logic in response to control signals from said host unit; a buffer capturing data processed by said DSP core logic; and communication logic for transferring said control signals and said captured data

between said VHDL macro and said host unit on page 4, paragraphs 0056 – 0057,0060,0061,0067.

9. As per claim 19, Edwards et al. discloses a signal processing unit; a plurality of memory blocks; a on-chip logic analysis (OCLA) unit capturing data processed by said signal processing unit without interrupting operations of said signal processing unit, wherein said OCLA unit is controlled by a host unit externally provided to said single chip device on page 4, paragraphs 0056 – 0057,0060,0061,0067.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al. in view of Circello et al. (USPN 5964893). As per claim 7, Edwards et al. fails to explicitly state a user interface enabling a user to control said OCLA system and presenting said captured data to the user.

Circello et al. discloses this limitation in column 15, lines 19-26.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a user interface enabling a user to control said OCLA system and presenting said captured data to the user. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a user interface enabling a user to control said OCLA system and presenting said captured data to the user because a user

Art Unit: 2113

interface allows the user to view the operations of the processor and control the operations of the trace function.

12. As per claim 8, Edwards et al. fails to explicitly state said user interface is a graphic user interface (GUI).

Circello et al. discloses this limitation in column 15, lines 19-23.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have said user interface is a graphic user interface (GUI). A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have said user interface is a graphic user interface (GUI) because a GUI is a type of interface that is used to view data.

13. As per claim 9, Edwards et al. discloses an interface unit transferring said controls signals from said host system to said data capturing unit and transferring said captured data from said data capturing unit to said host unit; and a memory unit storing said control signals and said captured data on page 4, paragraphs 0056 – 0057,0060,0061,0067.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yolanda Wilson whose telephone number is (703) 305-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703) 305-9713. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 09/683,091
Art Unit: 2113

Page 6

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100